

REMARKS

The rejections presented in the Office Action dated June 21, 2004 have been considered. Claims 1-16 remain pending in the application. Reconsideration and allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by US patent 5,794,239 to Walster et al. ("Walster"). The rejection is traversed for the reasons set forth in the Amendment and Response filed March 31, 2004, the arguments of which are incorporated by reference into this response.

Claim 1 sets forth a method for automating operations of a computing arrangement that is coupled to a message processor. The limitations include establishing a pattern database including a plurality of pattern definitions and response definitions, each pattern definition being associated with one or more associated response definitions, and one or more of the response definitions including one or more commands and instructions for queuing a command to a command queue having storage available for a plurality of commands; receiving message character strings at the message processor; searching the pattern database for pattern definitions that match the message character strings; and for the pattern definitions that match the messages, adding associated commands to the command queue in processing the response definitions; and dequeuing commands from the command queue and issuing the commands to the computing arrangement. The Office Action does not show that Walster teaches all of these limitations.

For example, the recent Office Action alleges "that the claimed limitation of queuing commands to the command queue can be construed as commands being routed at different times to a storage system in a particular order" and that Walster similarly teaches "the issuance of a plurality of commands routed over time to a storage medium." This rationale is unfounded because it ignores pertinent associated limitations and misconstrues the teachings of Walster.

The associated limitations that are ignored state that one or more of the response definitions includes instructions for queuing a command to a command queue. There are no teachings in Walster of any response definition including instructions for queueing a command to a command queue. The Office Action cites Walster's FIG. 2, element 54 as meeting these limitations. However, this element simply illustrates "output from the message processor." (col.

7, l. 13). There is no suggestion, explicit or implicit, that Walster's pattern database 44 has response definitions including instructions for queueing commands to a command queue.


The Office Action is also mistaken in contending that "Walster's teaching of forwarding commands to a storage medium at different times implicitly discloses the instructions for forwarding the commands to the storage medium since the instructions can be construed as the actual requests to queue the commands to the storage medium." The fact that commands may be queued during the course of processing by some command processor does not imply that the entity issuing a command (e.g., the pattern database) also includes instructions for queueing the command (the response definitions with the commands and instructions). In other words, the issuing entity is not required to have instructions for queueing the commands if the processing entity itself queues the commands.

The Office Action has only shown that Walster's pattern database has commands; no showing has been made that Walster's database also contains instructions for queueing the commands. For at least the reasons set forth above and those set forth in the Response of March 31, 2004, the Office Action fails to show that Walster anticipates the present invention as set forth in claims 1-16.

No extension of time is believed to be necessary for consideration of this response. However, if an extension of time is required, please consider this a petition for a sufficient number of months for consideration of this response. If there are any additional fees in connection with this response, please charge Deposit Account No. 50-0996 (USYS.028PA).

Respectfully submitted,

CRAWFORD MAUNU PLLC
1270 Northland Drive, Suite 390
Saint Paul, MN 55120
(651) 686-6633

By: 
Name: LeRoy D. Maunu
Reg. No.: 35,274